DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 878 JC 790 419

AUTHOR McKay, Elizabeth R.
TITLE A Longitudinal Study of Administrative Evaluation of the MBO System from 1973 to 1977.
PUB DATE 9 Dec 77
NOTE 78p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Change; Administrative Policy; *Administrator Attitudes; *Changing Attitudes; College Administration; Community Colleges; Evaluation Criteria; Job Satisfaction; *Junior Colleges; *Management by Objectives; Management Systems; Organizational Climate; *Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

An administrative program based on Management by Objectives (MBO) was instituted at William Rainey Harper College in 1969 and evaluated in 1973. The evaluation instrument used in 1973 was re-administered in 1977 in order to determine the effectiveness of the current MBO program and administrators' perceptions and evaluations. Subsections of the survey form, completed by 36 Harper administrators, included general evaluation of and commitment to MBO; formulation and implementation of objectives; appraisal process; perception of supervisor; and description of job, self, and institutional organization. Responses were compared to 1973 responses and the percentages of difference were tabulated. Results indicate that administrators of the MBO system at Harper College in 1977 were not as satisfied as those in 1973. There was a decrease in positive perceptions in the seven areas surveyed. Respondents indicated that MBO did not help them in planning; and that little supervisory assistance existed. A significant percentage of respondents stated that their job satisfaction had decreased over the four-year period and a large percentage perceived no increase in personal job effectiveness. A literature review is included and the survey instrument is appended. (DR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172878

A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION OF THE MBO SYSTEM FROM 1973 TO 1977

by

Elizabeth R. McKay, M.S.

William Rainey Harper College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Elizabeth R. McKay

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 790 419

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

DECEMBER 9, 1977

Abstract

William Rainey Harper College has been managed by a system of Management by Objectives since 1969. As this process has evolved, Harper has evaluated the system, identified its strengths and weaknesses and attempted to make improvements where necessary. Administrators were surveyed to determine their perceptions of the present MBO systems. This practicum compared the results of the 1973 administrative evaluation with the responses received during this study. The results have shown that the administrative team was not as satisfied with MBO in 1977 as it was in 1973. There was a decrease in positive perceptions in each area of the evaluation form that the writer sampled. Recommendations included a thorough evaluation of the present management style, a further development of administrators to effective managers, and the initiation of a system of organizational development concurrently with the MBO process. This practicum illustrated a dissatisfaction with the system of Management by Objectives as currently employed by Harper College. This should be dealt with in the near future and changes implemented to improve the college management and governance system.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	5
PROCEDURES	18
RESULTS	21
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	53
REFERENCES	58
BIBLIOGRAPHY	60
APPENDIX A	61
APPENDIX B	62
APPENDIX C	72

Tables

		Page
Table 1	Commitment of Harper Administrators to MBO in 1973 and 1977	22
Table 2	Administrative Perceptions of MBO at Harper College in 1973 and 1977	24
Table 3	Administrative Satisfaction With Objective Development in 1973 and 1977	27
Table 4	Administrative Perceptions of Objective Formulation in 1973 and 1977	30
Table 5	Administrators' Perception of Coaching Toward Objective Implementation in 1973 and 1977	32
Table 6	Administrative Perceptions on the Achievement of Objectives from 1973 to 1977	34
Table 7	Administrators' Perceptions of the Effect of the Appraisal Process on Objective Implementation for 1973 to 1977	36
Table 8	Administrative Perceptions of Ratings Received During the Appraisal Process in 1973 and 1977	39
Table 9	Administrators' Perceptions of Problem Resolution in 1973 and 1977	41
Table 10	Administrative Perceptions of Organizational Readiness for Creative Change in 1973 and 1977	43
Table 11	Administrative Perceptions of Superior's Managerial Effectiveness as a Result of MBO from 1973 to 1977	45

Tables, Continued

		Page
Table 12	Administrators' Perceptions of MBO's Effect on Subordinate and Supervisor Relationships From 1973 to 1977	47
Table 13	Administrators' Perceptions of Change in Job Satisfaction in the Last Year From 1973 to 1977	49
Table 14	Administrators' Perceptions of Their Effectiveness In Their Jobs In 1973 and 1977	51

Introduction

William Rainey Harper College was founded as the community college serving the residents of District 512 in 1967. Shortly after the initiation of the college, the president of the college sent approximately twenty administrators to management seminars conducted by the university schools of business or industrial relations to sensitize administrators to the field of management and expose them to professional managers in business and industry. (Lahti, 1972)

From its inception, Harper College has made sincere efforts to unleash and utilize its human resources to the maximum. An Administrative Study Committee was formed for the purpose of recommending a management development program appropriate to the needs of Harper administrators. Recognizing that effective decision making, utilization of time, delegation and leadership development were seldom a part of the training for upward mobile academicians, the Committee

began to investigate the application of tested management principles. As the study progressed, through actual participation in management seminars by committee members, it became apparent that many managerial skills and processes could be borrowed from the business-industrial sector and applied to the field of higher education. (William Rainey Harper College, 1969-70)

From this small beginning a developmental program of implementation of a system of management by objectives was begun. During its development, college managers took part in a number of seminars, workshops and other programing every year to enhance their management skills and to aquaint them with the MBO process.

MBO was formally begun at Harper College in 1969 and it has operated on this management system since that time. During this time period the system has been evaluated twice. The first of these evaluations was done in 1972 and a follow-up study was accomplished in 1973. These evaluations were done to evaluate the system, identify its strengths and weaknesses, and make corrections if needed. (Evaluation, 1973) When the 1977-78 institutional goals were adopted by the Harper College Board of Trustees, one of the subsequent

goals was to assess the effectiveness of the MBO system. From this assessment will proceed the development of the management system and appraisal process for administrators at Harper College.

This practicum compared the results of the evaluation of the MBO system in 1973 with the responses received in 1977. This comparison showed how administrative perceptions have changed or remained constant during the four year period.

As one of Harper's adopted institutional goals was to assess the effectiveness of the MBO management system, this study has impact for the college by illustrating the strengths and weaknesses of the present system. This information has relevance for the institution as it will assist the institution in the further development and refinement of the college's governance and management system.

The study was carried out in cooperation with the Office of Planning and Research. The MBO evaluation form was distributed to all Harper administrators and to any persons who had participated in the administrative development program. This form was identical to the one distributed

in 1973 and this increased the reliability of the study. A follow-up memo was distributed to encourage administrators to return their completed questionnaire. Responses were tabulated and compared with those compiled in 1973. The responses indicated that administrators had changed their perceptions of the MBO system since 1973 and these changes are described in the results and discussion sections of this practicum.

Background and Significance

Odiorne defines MBO as the process whereby the superior and subordinate managers of an organization jointly identify its common goals, define each individual's major areas of responsibility in terms of results expected of him and use these measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contribution of each of its members. (Odiorne-1967)

The major common elements in MBO systems are that objectives are established for positions, that objectives are set jointly and that they are linked with each other. (Reddin-1971)

To be successful in any organization that is viewed as bureaucratic, professional assistance must be enlisted. West points out that in such a setting psychological training should be given to all managers before goals are set and that an internal MBO ombudsman should be employed to assist in implementation. (West-1977)

The MBO system had its birth in the business organizational setting but Carroll and Tosi predicted that in the future MBO will be extended to non-business institutions

such as governmental agencies, hospitals and educational institutions. (Carroll and Tosi-1973)

Arthur Deegan in his workboo' MBO Goes to College pointed out that higher education needs effective management even more than money. Some of the advantages of an effective MBO system are improved planning, communications and motivation within the management te m. (Deegan-1975) Two concepts that are common to all MBO programs are that the clearer the idea one has of what one is trying to accomplish, the greater the chances of accomplishing it, and that the progress toward accomplishment can only be measured in terms of a goal. (Lahti-1973)

Lahti has identified eleven steps for implementing the MBO system in the two year college. These are as follows:

1. The central purpose and function of the organization must be generally understood and agreed upon.
2. Institutional goals for the specific year must be drawn up and agreed upon by a significant number of the organization's constituencies.
3. Each subunit's purpose and how it is integrated into the whole of the organization should be understood and agreed upon.
4. Position descriptions must be available for all organizational jobs.
5. Each subordinate must establish his major performance objectives for the coming year in measureable

terms with specific deadline dates.

6. The subordinate and supervisor enter into a joint review for a mutually agreed upon set of objectives.

7. A date schedule is agreed upon and established for the purpose of reviewing progress.

8. A report summarizing major accomplishments and variances between results achieved and results expected is prepared by the subordinate at the end of the year.

9. The annual accomplishment report is discussed jointly by supervisor and subordinate.

10. A new set of objectives is established for the next year.

11. Long-range objectives are received and adjusted in accordance with the degree of achievement for the present year goals, and a new commitment is made to new objectives. (Lahti-1973)

These eleven steps outlined by Robert E. Lahti, first president of Harper College from 1965-1977, have been implemented in varying degrees at Harper since 1969. This practicum has important implications for the future management style of the college for it illustrated how the administrative team viewed the present form of college governance and accountability. Therefore, this practicum not only related directly to the college governance module but also had an obvious relationship to the writer's institution.

Inherent in all descriptions of the MBO system was the appraisal process. MBO has been used at Harper to identify goals and activities and also to measure performance of administrators. Literature has shown that there is a growing concern for and interest in the assessment of administrative performance in higher education. This evaluation of personnel has been described as a review process to assess individual performance and to make a value judgement concerning this assessment for the benefit of the individual and the organization. (Fisher-1977)

In this assessment process Wiard has made a case for positive reinforcement of desirable behavior. He pointed out that people perform in ways they find most rewarding to them and that by providing proper rewards, it is possible to increase performance. He also described three considerations in any positive reinforcement program. They were as follows:

1. Desired levels of performance should be very specifically determined and once determined, they should be clearly stated.

2. Rewards for desired performance should be appropriate to the performance but most of all they should be rewarding.

3. Rewards should follow desired performance as

closely as possible. (Wiard-1972)

Many of the outlined points are clearly related to MBO as subordinate and manager outline goals, periodically review progress, and discuss final outcomes. This process has been followed at Harper College in administrative evaluations.

The most common rationale for evaluating college and university administrators included the following elements as synthesized by Fisher:

1. To identify, through evaluation feedback, needed areas of individual professional development and personal growth.
2. To improve individual administrative performance.
3. To help define more clearly individual objectives consistent with institutional missions and goals.
4. To improve internal communications, administrative teamwork, and the overall management of the institution.
5. To reward outstanding administrative performance.
6. To validate the selection, retention, salary and promotion processes.
7. To inventory personnel resources for reassignment or training.
8. To help answer the external demands for accountability from government, trustees, alumni, and the

general public, and thus improve the credibility of the administrative process.

9. To help answer the internal demands for accountability from faculty and students (who ask, If I am subject to evaluation, why not administrators?), and thus improve the credibility of the administrative process.

10. To enlighten all audiences regarding the institution's integrity and worth.

(Fisher-1977)

The requirements of an effective appraisel system as described by Koontz were also applicable to the MBO system. He stated five items as necessary ones for an effective program. They were:

1. Program should measure the right things.
2. Program should be operational.
3. Program should be as objective as possible.
4. Program should be acceptable to involved personnel.
5. Program should be constructive and should lead to growth and development.

(Koontz-1971)

These five requirements have been endorsed by the Harper management team and used as guides for the appraisal system. In addition, a manual Managerial Performance and Appraisal has been published by the Office of the President. This

publication outlined the performance appraisal system and its philosophical basis. In addition it stated the following: "Management must understand fundamental behavioral findings and hypotheses about the nature of people as they function in organizations. Some of the findings and hypotheses are as follows:

1. People have a drive toward growth and self-realization.
2. Work which is organized to meet people's needs as well as to achieve organizational requirements tends to produce the highest productivity and quality of production.
3. Individuals whose basic needs are met do not seek a soft and secure environment. They are interested in work, challenge, and responsibility. In return they expect recognition and satisfying interpersonal relationships.
4. Personal growth is facilitated by relationships which are honest, caring and non-manipulative.
5. Persons in groups which go through a managed process of increasing openness about both their positive and negative feelings develop a stronger identification with the goals of the group and its other members. The group becomes increasingly capable of dealing constructively with potentially disruptive issues.
6. The ability to be flexible and responsive flows naturally from groups which feel a common identification and an ability to influence their environment.

Accepting these assumptions and initiating processes

which will release the human potential of an organization by diagnosing its roadblocks leads to organizational development. Organizational development becomes operative when roadblocks to the release of human potential are identified and minimized or eliminated. (William Rainey Harper College-1977)

The publication also related that a performance appraisal system has the best chance of succeeding when the following conditions are present in an organization:

1. A well-defined institutional mission is written and agreed upon by all employees of the organization.
2. A progressive and contemporary style of management leadership and philosophy is understood and practiced by the organization's managers.
3. A sound wage and salary administration program is in existence and adhered to.
4. A well-conceived system of results management is understood and practiced by its management.
5. The objectives and elements of a performance appraisal system are articulated and agreed upon by the organization's managers.
6. A substantial orientation program is offered to the individuals who will be involved in the program.

The key to a successful program is dynamic communication between the supervisor and subordinate who together plan for

and evaluate the subordinate's performance. William Rainey Harper College-1977)

Consistent with this premise is that MBO can yield results only as good as the information and managerial prowess within the people who are responsible for the input. (Lahti-1972) This statement illustrated that the success of the MBO system is like all other management styles that are dependent on the persons implementing them.

Some shortcomings of MBO in practice as identified by Koontz are as follows:

1. Learning the system is difficult.
2. Failure to give goal setters guidelines.
3. Failure to assure a network of goals
4. Setting arbitrary goals.
5. Failure to insist on verifiability.
6. Overinsistence on numbers.
7. Use of inapplicable standards.
8. Dangers of inflexibility.
9. Failure of adequate review, counseling and control.

(Koontz- 1973)

Lahti has also outlined other reasons why MBO sometimes

fails and they are as follows:

1. The individuals affected by the system are not allowed to participate fully in strategies of implementation and decision making.

2. Individuals within an organization do not exchange information in an "open" climate.

3. Individuals are evaluated in terms of personality rather than achievement.

4. Individuals are not encouraged to develop self-control, and there is little emphasis placed upon self-appraisal of results.

5. Supervision is found to be non-supportive of both the organization and its systems as well as human development.

6. Individuals are more "blame" oriented than problems or results oriented.

7. Individuals are not engaged in self-evaluation.

(Lahti-1972)

As previously mentioned, an evaluation of the MBO system has been undertaken in 1972 and in 1973 at Harper College to identify strengths and weaknesses of the system and to make corrections if needed. The instrument was developed so that any organization using MBO could conduct the same evaluation. (Evaluation-1973) This evaluation process was consistent with the goals of periodically evaluating the management system at Harper College.

In addition to these evaluations in the Spring of 1977,

the Harper Board of Trustees decided that an administrative audit should be conducted at Harper College. Tadlock Associates Inc. began a management audit in July 1977 to focus on the basis for present tensions at the College so that corrective action could be taken and the College could refocus on educational results rather than administrative processes. (Tadlock-1977) During the course of the audit, MBO at Harper was discussed and some administrators were found to be very supportive of this as a technique but few felt that it yielded the results promised. Weaknesses were identified which showed MBO to be process oriented and effective where a sense of collegeality existed to give it a human dimension. Tadlock also reported that MBO may need to be replaced by other management tools which can inspire staff confidence and full participation. (Tadlock-1977)

This practicum was conceived after the Tadlock Report and the results of the evaluation may have been influenced by the report. In addition, four years have elapsed since the last evaluation which may account for the current results.

Organizational Development (OD) defined as a planned, managed, systematic process to change the culture, systems and behavior of an organization in order to improve the

organization's effectiveness in solving its problems and achieving its objectives has been found as being relevent to the MBO system. (Hillmer-1974) Odiorne has discussed that MBO has persisted where objectives are financial and where functional aspects are easier to see and readily defined. He also has pointed out that those aspects requiring a behavioral orientation or face-to-face discussion and group participation have never been fully accepted. (Odiorne-1977) These elements have contributed to reports of MBO failure and may be evident in the results section of this practicum. In addition, the following unmet expectations have not brought about improvements in applied behavioral sciences in the organization:

1. Expectations that MBO would universally produce participative management have not been met.
2. The expectation that MBO would produce group management has not made much progress.
3. A tendency to make MBO an exchange of pieces of paper is widespread.

(Odiorne-1977)

To be successful in MBO (West-1977) has said that psychological training should be conducted with all managers before goals are set. This orientation is consistent with

the development of O.D. and MBO in a simultaneous manner. O.D. and MBO meet when consideration is given to applying MBO in the context of groups working toward organizational effectiveness with emphasis on the contributions of human systems and resources toward the goals. (Hillmer-1974) These findings will be important as the recommendations are developed for this study.

Procedures

The writer performed the following activities in carrying out the practicum. Some of these were carried out in conjunction with the Harper College Office of Planning and Research.

1. The literature was reviewed in the following areas and was presented in the section on background and significance.
   a. Background information on Management by Objectives.
   b. Application of MBO to educational institutions.
   c. Planning and development of the MBO system at Harper College.
   d. Appraisal techniques in relation to MBO.
   e. Deficiencies in and alternatives to MBO.
2. These activities were performed in cooperation with the Office of Planning and Research.
   a. On September 23, 1977 a letter of explanation was sent to all administrators which explained the purpose of the study and requested the confidential completion and return of the evaluation form. (Appendix A)
   b. An evaluation form identical to the form developed by the Office of Planning and Research and distributed in 1973 to the administrative staff was sent with the explanatory letter to all administrators. (Appendix B)

c. A follow-up memo was sent on October 10, 1977 to all administrators after the initial distribution to encourage additional responses. (Appendix C)

3. Data were tabulated to determine comparative figures between the 1973 and 1977 survey and are presented in the Results section of this practicum by the subparts in the evaluation form.

   a. General evaluation of MBO

   b. Objective formulation.

   c. Objective implementation.

   d. Appraisal process.

   e. Description of Harper's organization.

   f. Perception of supervisor.

   g. Description of job and self.

Some of the underlying assumptions were that all administrators who completed the form had been actively involved in the MBO process, and were interested in providing input for further refinement of the system. It was also assumed that there would be some changes in perceptions of administrators due to the present Harper climate and administrative audit report on September 22, 1977.

Limitations of the study were the following:

1. There has been a four year lapse of time since the last evaluation which may have influenced some responses.

2. Not all of the administrative team completed the evaluation form.

3. Administrative morale appeared to be low during the time of the survey as merit pay was reduced, contract terminology changed, and 1977-78 administrative contracts were delayed by the Board of Trustees as well as other intitutional tensions.

Terms such as MBO and O.D. were defined in the review of literature and other terminology did not need additional description for this study.

Results

Thirty-six Harper administrators completed the 1977 evaluation form. Their responses were tabulated and percentages computed based on the 36 responses. These were in contrast to the 33 persons who participated in the 1973 survey, and percentages of difference were also tabulated. Selective responses to questions in each of the 7 areas have been shown on the 14 tables which follow in this section.

Administrators were asked to rate their degree of commitment to MBO. Their responses follow:

Table 1

Commitment of Harper Administrators

to MBO in 1973 and 1977

Degree of Commitment	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
Very Committed	8	24.2	5	13.9	-10.3
Committed	18	54.6	11	30.6	-24
Gone Along	7	21.2	15	41.7	+20.5
Indifferent	0	0	3	8.3	+ 8.3
Opposed to it	0	0	2	5.5	+ 5.5
	33	100.0	36	100.0	

In 1977 administrators were less commited to MBO than in 1973 according to percentage of responses. All responses indicating commitment decreased while those showing lack of commitment or passiveness increased.

In looking at MBO in general, questions was also posed regarding self perceptions of the MBO system at Harper College. Participants were asked to check all responses which were

appropriate. This request resulted in total responses being greater than the number of persons completing the form in this tabulation as well as in other items with the same instructions.

Table 2

Administrative Perceptions of MBO

at Harper College in 1973 and 1977

Perceptions	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. It causes the participants to be bogged down in a mire of paperwork.	1	3.0	8	22.0	+19.0
B. It sounds good in theory but has no effect on members of the organization.	6	18.2	13	36.0	+17.8
C. The system helps members plan better.	14	42.4	17	47.0	+ 4.6
D. The process aids employees in developing themselves to improve their performance.	11	33.3	6	16.0	-17.3
E. MBO generates a lot of anxiety among the participants.	4	12.1	11	31.0	+18.9

Table 2, Continued

Perceptions	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
F. MBO provides objective criteria by which employees can be fairly evaluated.	16	48.5	4	11.0	-37.5
G. The system calls for too many coaching, developing or counseling conferences which waste valuable time.	1	3.0	1	2.0	- 1.0
H. It requires too many meetings to make decisions	3	9.1	3	8.0	- 1.0

All but three of the of the responses that were returned by administrators to these questions decreased in positive perceptions. Respondents indicated that MBO does help in planning and that there were not too many conferences or meetings in the system. The two questions selected for the illustrated tables indicated that administrators perceptions of MBO had decreased since 1973.

Subpart two of the questionnaire dealt with objective formulation. The following table indicated the degree of satisfaction experienced by administrators with the results of their objective formulation and participants were instructed to check all applicable responses.

Table 3

Administrative Satisfaction With

Objective Development in 1973 and 1977

Satisfaction	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. My objectives pretty accurately reflect my total job responsibilities.	13	39.4	15	42.0	+ 2.6
B. I find creative goals are stifled as a result of the objective writing process	4	12.1	5	14.0	+ 1.9
C. My finished objectives don't adequately reflect the importance of my routine duties.	11	33.3	18	50.0	+16.7
D. I find some of my goals are difficult to quantify and therefore, aren't adequately reflected in my finished objectives	11	33.3	13	36.0	+ 2.7

Table 3, Continued

Satisfaction	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
E. Didn't write any objectives.	0	0	0	0	
F. Forced to have four categories of objectives.	0	0	7	19.0	+19.0
G. Each objective shouldn't be weighted or evaluated equally.	0	0	14	39.0	+ 3.9
H. No meaning to deadline.	1	3.4	10	28.0	+24.6

Administrative responses to this item indicated that there had been an increase in dissatisfaction in objective formulation. The only positive response was an increase in the percentage of those who thought their objectives reflected their total job responsibilities.

Administrators also were asked to evaluate how their objectives were set. Their responses were the following:

Table 4

Administrative Perceptions of

Objective Formulation in 1973 and 1977

Objective Formulation	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. My supervisor determines my objectives for the coming year.	1	3.0	2	5.7	+ 2.7
B. An intermediate condition between A and C.	4	12.1	6	17.2	+ 5.1
C. There is an interaction process whereby my supervisor and myself mutually determine and agree upon my objectives.	20	60.6	13	37.1	-23.5
D. An intermediate condition between C and E.	5	15.2	7	20.0	+ 4.8
E. I set my own objectives and my supervisor mechanically approves.	3	9.1	7	20.0	+10.9
	33	100.0	35	100.0	

The setting of objectives has decreased in the interaction process between supervisor and subordinate with less mutual discussion in 1977 than in 1973.

The next subpart to be reported illustrated how objectives were implemented. The literature has revealed that coaching is an important part of the MBO process. The following table illustrates administrative experience with this technique.

Table 5

Administrators' Perception of Coaching

Toward Objective Implementation in 1973 and 1977

Coaching and Implementation	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. I have no need for coaching	8	23.0	6	17.6	- 5.4
B. I have received the coaching I needed from my supervisor	20	57.0	17	50.0	- 7.0
C. I have received the coaching I needed from other persons	3	8.6	2	5.7	- 2.9
D. I have received the coaching I needed from the literature.	1	2.8	1	2.7	- .1
E. I needed help in implementing my objectives but I have not received adequate coaching as yet.	3	8.6	8	24.0	15.4
	35	100.0	34	100.0	

One half of the administrative team responded that they received the coaching they needed from their supervisor but the number of those indicating a need for help in implementation of their objectives increased.

In addition, the participants were asked who determines how the objectives will be achieved. The responses were as follows:

Table 6

Administrative Perceptions on the

Achievement of Objectives from 1973 to 1977

Achievement of Objectives	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. My supervisor maintains close control on how I implement my objectives.	2	6.1	16	47.0	+40.9
B. My supervisor provides some general guidelines for implementing my objectives.	19	57.6	14.5	43.0	-14.6
C. I solely determine the implementation process (within budget restrictions).	12	36.3	3.5	10.0	-26.3
	33	100.0	34.0	100.0	

The responses to this question indicated that supervisors have increased their control on implementation of objectives. The individual administrator appeared to perceive himself as having a decreased role in determining how objectives will be achieved than in 1973.

The appraisal process was identified as subpart IV of the form and was also rated as to its effectiveness in regard to objective implementation. The responses to this item are illustrated in Table 7 and administrators were asked to check all that applied.

Table 7

Administrators Perceptions of the Effect

of The Appraisal Process on Objective Implementation for

1973 to 1977

Effect on Objectives	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. No effect, I had things well under control	10	30.3	13	26.5	-3.8
B. No effect, it was a mechanical process.	2	6.1	6	12.2	+6.1
C. I discovered some areas where more emphasis needs to be placed.	18	54.6	15	30.6	-24.0
D. I discovered areas in which I need more coaching and made the necessary arrangements to receive this coaching.	5	15.2	3	6.2	-9.0
E. I discovered areas in which I need more coaching but I have no idea where to go from here.	1	3.0	0	0	-3.0

Table 7, Continued

Effect on Objectives	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
F. I feel positively motivated	6	18.2	6	12.2	-6.0
G. I feel frustrated.	3	9.1	6	12.2	+3.1

Administrators rated the effect of the appraisal process on objective implementation lower in 1977 and there was also an increase in the feelings of frustration.

They were also asked to rate the fairness of the ratings during the appraisal process and the results are found in Table 8.

Table 8

Administrative Perceptions of Ratings Received

During the Appraisal Process in 1973 and 1977

Fairness of Rating	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. I am underrated. I know other people in the organization doing no better job than I am who receive better ratings.	12.5	37.9	22	64.7	+26.8
B. I feel I am fairly rated.	15.5	47.0	10	29.4	-17.6
C. I feel I am overrated compared to other people I know in the organization.	0	0	0	0	0
D. No opinion.	5	15.1	2	5.9	- 9.2
	33	100.0	34	100.0	

According to this data, administrators did not feel that they were fairly rated and the 1977 form showed a increase in these feelings from 1973.

In subpart 5, the respondents were asked to evaluate the organization by evaluating certain elements of the institution. Table 9 illustrated how administrators perceive the resolution of problems and appropriate response(s) were checked.

Table 9

Administrators' Perceptions of Problem Resolution in 1973 and 1977

Individual Reactions	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. Search for someone to blame.	10	30.3	21	60.2	+29.9
B. Take immediate steps to protect themselves from the blame.	15	45.5	24	82.8	+37.3
C. Engage in a problem-solving process.	20	60.6	6	17.1	-43.5
D. Avoid facing the problem	5	15.2	12	34.3	+19.1

There was a definite increase in self protection and blame-placing in 1977. A 43% decrease in the problem-solving process in problem resolution by administrators was also evident in the responses received.

Creative change was evaluated by administrators and the ease by which it occurred. The results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Administrative Perceptions of Organizational Readiness for Creative Change in 1973 and 1977

Readiness for Change	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. Yes, whenever change can be justified.	3	9.1	3	8.3	- .8
B. Intermediate step between A and C.	13	39.4	8	22.2	-17.2
C. Only after much effort and a long period of time.	9	27.3	10.5	29.2	+ 1.9
D. Only after a monumental effort.	7	21.2	10.5	29.2	+ 8.0
E. It is hopeless.	1	3.0	3	8.3	+ 5.3
F. No opinion.	—	—	1	2.8	+ 2.8
	33	100.0	35.0	100.0	

Administrators did not perceive that creative change could readily occur at Harper College. In fact, there was an increase in those who thought that it was more difficult to effect a change in 1977 than in 1973.

The participants were requested to rate their perceptions of their supervisor in relation to the MBO process in subpart 6 of the evaluation. The results shown in the following table show these perceptions in relation to their superior's managerial effectiveness.

Table 11

Administrative Perceptions of Superior's Managerial Effectiveness as a Result of MBO from 1973 to 1977

Supervisor More Effective?	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. Definitely yes.	8	24.2	9	25.0	+ .8
B. Maybe.	10	30.3	4	11.2	-19.1
C. I doubt it.	9	27.3	13	36.1	+ 8.8
D. Definitely not.	1	3.0	4	11.1	+ 8.1
E. It has made him less effective.	0	0	1	2.8	+ 2.8
F. It is hard to judge.	5	15.2	5	13.8	- 1.4
	33	100.0	36	100.0	

Administrators' perceptions of their supervisors' effectiveness as a manager as a result of MBO demonstrated their feelings that MBO does not increase effectiveness but that it either has not influenced effectiveness or produced a less effective manager.

The respondents were asked to rate how MBO has effected the relationship between the individual person and the supervisor.

Table 12

Administrators' Perceptions of MBO's Effect on Subordinate and Supervisor Realtionships From 1973 to 1977

MBO's Effect on Relationship	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. It has nad no effect.	9	30.0	15	42.0	+12.0
B. It has led both of us to a better understanding of each others areas of responsibility.	14	46.6	8	22.0	-23.4
C. It has led both of us to a better understanding of my area of responsibility.	5	16.7	5	14.0	- 2.7
D. Reduced relationship to a very formal nit-picking nature.	0	0	2	6.0	+ 6.0
E. It has affected our relationship in another way.	2	6.7	6	16.0	+ 9.3
	30	100.0	36	100.0	

Administrators did not perceive MBO to have had a positive effect on their relationships with their supervisors. The greatest percentage increase was in the area of "no effect," and others rated the process as decreasing the understanding between the involved persons.

Harper administrators were also asked to evaluate the description of their job and themselves as the final part of the evaluation form. Their responses to two of the items are found in Tables 13 and 14.

Table 13

Administrators Perceptions of Change in Job Satisfaction in the Last Year From 1973 to 1977

Job Satisfaction	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. My satisfaction with the job is much higher this year than it was a year ago.	3	9.4	6	16.7	+ 5.3
B. Intermediate step between A and C.	11	34.4	3	8.3	-26.1
C. My satisfaction level is unchanged.	4	12.5	5	13.9	+ 1.4
D. Intermediate step between C and E.	2	6.2	7	19.4	+ 7.2
E. My satisfaction with the job is much lower this year than it was a year ago.	10	31.3	15	41.7	+10.3
F. It is hard to judge.	2	6.2	0	0	0
	32	100.0	36	100.0	

Administrators responded significantly that their perceptions of their job satisfaction had decreased over the four year period. The greatest percentage difference was in the decrease in responses between satisfaction increasing and it remaining unchanged as well as the response which indicated that job satisfaction had decreased.

The respondents were also asked to evaluate their effectiveness to perform their jobs in the past year. These responses are found in Table 14.

Table 14

Administrators' Perceptions of Their Effectiveness

In Their Jobs In 1973 and 1977

Job Effectiveness	1973 Number	1973 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent	Percent Difference
A. My effectiveness on the job is much greater this year than it was a year ago.	12	38.7	9	25.0	-13.7
B. Intermediate step between A and C.	9	29.0	7	19.4	- 9.6
C. My effectiveness on the job is unchanged.	5	16.1	9	25.0	+ 8.9
D. Intermediate step between C and E.	2	6.5	5	13.9	+ 7.4
E. My effectiveness on the job is much lower this year than it was a year ago.	2	6.5	6	16.7	+10.2
F. It is hard to judge.	1	3.2	0	0	
	31	100.0	36	100.0	

The greatest changes in this item were found in the percentage decrease in the increase in job effectiveness response and the percentage increase in the decrease of job effectiveness response. Administrators do not appear to perceive that they have increased their effectiveness in job performance from 1973 to 1977.

The implications and recommendations as a result of this data are found in the following section.

Discussion, Implications and Recommendations

The 1977 evaluation by administrators of the MBO system at Harper College has shown that the administrative team was not as satisfied with the process as it was in 1973. In fact there was a decrease in positive perceptions in each of the seven areas the writer sampled.

The responses in this study have illustrated that at the present time the MBO process may be considered to have failed in some aspects at Harper. Reddin cited ten reasons why MBO sometimes fails. Some of these were identified by administrators in their answers to the questionnaire. Lack of commitment, poor implementation methods, little coaching and assistance, creative goals stifled, over emphasized appraisal and a mechanical approach have been identified as negative aspects by the respondents as well as listed as reasons MBO fails by Reddin. (Reddin-1971)

Administrators also felt that the organizational climate was not an "open" one and that they were not allowed to participate fully in decision making. Specifically a "blame orientation" was identified as the prevalent response to a problem, and this is also identified in the literature

as a cause for unhappiness with the MBO process.

These results as well as the present climate at Harper point out a real need for a thorough evaluation of the present management style, philosophy and educational leadership. Many other environmental factors have and are playing a direct role at the college. These are too numerous to mention but an antithetical climate is presently pervasive at the college.

The results of this study have many implications for Harper, its staff and community. Unless progress can be made in the climate of MBO and college governance, the educational program will be drastically affected. Persons cannot continue to work in such a negative environment as has been identified in the results of this study.

Administrators have begun to seek other positions as an alternative and this also has implications for the college as positions are unfilled and work load reassigned. The need for planning and programming is apparent.

MBO has been evaluated by the administrators completing the form as a system which helps one plan. This characteristically also has implications for Harper College as it

continues to plan its mission through both institutional and individual goals. The further refinement of the MBO process to include the unmet expectations of participating management and appropriate group management would have implications for Harper and other institutions using the MBO system of management.

It is the writer's thinking that there must be some significant changes in the management style and governance at Harper College as evidenced by the administrative responses to the present system and the review of the literature.

The description of MBO as found in the literature has shown specific applications to educational institutions especially in the planning process. This system would appear to be an excellent one for individual and institutional goal-setting and evaluation. However, as experts such as Odiorne and Koontz have pointed out MBO has not fulfilled the expectations of a humanistic, participative system. This was demonstrated at Harper by the responses to this evaluation and some action must be taken to make the management process more effective.

As a result of this study the following recommendations were made to the Office of Planning and Research:

1. The present system of college governance under MBO should be evaluated using the results of these evaluations, outside consultants and input from the administrative staff.

2. Harper College needs competent management and it should continue to develop its administrators into effective managers through administrative development seminars.

3. Administrators should be encouraged to develop action plans as a result of the report of the administrative audit and this survey to provide input for the future development management system.

4. A system of organizational development (OD) should be instituted concurrently with MBO to further sensitize Harper administrators to the needs of others in the organization specifically students, faculty, staff and other administrators.

5. Administrators should be encouraged to communicate with each other and lines of communication should be developed throughout all levels of the institution.

6. The Board of Trustees should endorse and support efforts to improve the Harper management style and develop a commitment to effective administrative process.

William Rainey Harper College has made a significant impact on its district since its founding in 1967. This comprehensive community college has a definite mission to serve the citizens of its community with effective broad-

based educational programs. This writer is proud to be a member of the staff of a community college with this potential. But it is also recognized that Harper College is not a panacea without problems. This practicum has illustrated a significant dissatisfaction with the MBO system as currently employed at the college. This dissatisfaction must be dealt with in the near future and changes made to improve the college management and governance system for the good of Harper administrators, faculty, staff and most importantly the citizens of District 512.

References

Carrol, Stephen J., and Tosi, Henry L. Management by Objectives. New York: MacMillan, 1973.

Deegan, Arthur X., and Fritz, Roger J. MBO Goes to College, Boulder, Colorado: The Regents of the University of Colorado, 1975.

Fisher, Charles F. "The Evaluation and Development of College and University Administrators", Research Currents Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse, March 1977, 3-6.

Hillman, Ellis D. "Where OD and MBO Meet," Paper to Second Annual International Conference on "Management by Objectives," August 1974, 1-12.

Koontz, Harold. Appraising Managers as Managers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Koontz, Harold. "Shortcomings and Pitfalls in Managing by Objectives," Management by Objectives, Vol. 1, No. 3, 6-12.

Lahti, Robert E. "Developing Leadership for the Management of Higher Education." College and University Business, Vol. 48, May 1970, 61-66.

Lahti, Robert E. "Implementing the System Means Learning to Manage Your Objectives." College and University Business, Feb. 1972, 43-46.

Lahti, Robert E. Innovative College Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss, 1973.

Odiorne, George S. Management by Objectives. New York: Pitman, 1965.

Odiorne, George S. "MBO in the 1980's: Will it Survive?" Management Review, Vol. 66, No. 7, July 1977, 39-42.

Reddin, W. J. Effective Management by Objectives, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Tadlock Associates Inc. (TAI). Administrative Audit. William Rainey Harper Community College, Los Altos, California. TAI, September, 1977.

West, George Edward. "Bureaupathology and the Failure of MBO," Human Resource Management. Vol. 16, No. 2, Summer 1977, 33-40.

Wiard, Harry. "Why Manage Behavior? A Case for Positive Reinforcement," Human Resource Management, Vol. II, No. 2, Summer 1972, 15-20.

William Rainey Harper College. "Developing Awareness," Administrative Development Seminars. Palatine, Illinois, 1969-70.

William Rainey Harper College, Office of the President. Managerial Performance and Appraisal. Palatine, Illinois, May 1977.

William Rainey Harper College, Evaluation of the MBO System at Harper College. Research Report Series, Vol. III, No. 16, April 1972.

William Rainey Harper College, Evaluation of the MBO System at Harper College. Research Report Series, Vol. IV, No. 22, June 1973.

Bibliography

Beck, Arthur C., and Hillmer, Ellis D. A Practical Approach to Organization Development Through MBO--Selected Readings. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1972.

Drucker, Peter F. Managing for Results. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Morrisey, George L. Managing by Objectives and Results. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.

Odiorne, George S. Training by Objectives. New York: MacMillan Company, 1970.

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Second Edition, Washington, D.C., 1976.

William Rainey Harper College
Algonquin and Roselle Roads
Palatine, Illinois 60067
312-397-3000

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH
September 23, 1977

Our present MBO Management system was installed back in 1969 but it is necessary to monitor this process from time to time.

To that end, one of the institutional goals this year is to assess the effectiveness of our MBO management system. Moreover, this year there is a special interest in the effectiveness of our appraisal system. In order to determine this effectiveness, we would like you to complete the attached evaluation instrument and return it to the Office of Planning and Research by October 3. As you can see, your name is not associated with your response, so feel free to answer as objectively and frankly as possible. We appreciate very much your cooperation in helping Harper to grapple with a very important institutional concern.

Sincerely,

John A. Lucas
Director

Attachment

MBO - EVALUATION

I. MBO general

1. Rate the degree to which you are personally committed to MBO. Check (✓) one.

_____ A. Very committed.
_____ B. Committed.
_____ C. I go along with it.
_____ D. Indifferent.
_____ E. Opposed to it.

2. Which most accurately describes your perception of the MBO system here at Harper. Check (✓) those which are appropriate.

_____ A. It causes the participants to be bogged down in a mire of paperwork.
_____ B. It sounds good in theory but has no effect on members of the organization.
_____ C. The system helps members plan better.
_____ D. The process aids employees in developing themsleves to improve their performance.
_____ E. MBO generates a lot of anxiety among the participants.
_____ F. MBO provides objective criteria by which employees can be fairly evaluated.
_____ G. The system calls for too many coaching, developing or counseling conference which waste valuable time.
_____ H. It requires too many meetings to make decisions.
_____ I. Other (specify) _____

3. What effect does MBO have on Harper's organization? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. It causes the organization to be very humanistic and strongly oriented toward people.
_____ B. It produces a tendency in the organization toward more humaness and concern for people.
_____ C. It has no effect.
_____ D. It produces a tendency toward less humaness and concern for people.
_____ E. It causes the organization to be much less humanistic and oriented toward people.
_____ F. I have no idea what effect MBO produces.

4. The following lists a critics consensus about education management. Mark (M) beside the alternative in which MBO has been most effective in correcting at Harper and (L) beside the alternative in which MBO has been least effective in correcting.

_____ A. Placid leadership.
_____ B. Lacking in management skills and systems.
_____ C. Poor long-range planning process.
_____ D. Lack of clearly defined goals.
_____ E. Inefficient utilization of facilities.
_____ F. Ineffective budgeting practices - the more available money, the higher the costs.
_____ G. Inefficient decision making.
_____ H. Lack of agreement about priorities among constituents of the organizaiton.
_____ I. Insufficient evaluation of the quality of output.

II. Objective formulation

1. When you write your own objectives, how satisfied are you with the results? Check (✓) those that apply.

_____ A. My objectives pretty accurately reflect my total job responsibilities.
_____ B. I find creative goals are stifled as a result of the objective writing process.
_____ C. My finished objectives don't adequately reflect the importance of my routine duties.
_____ D. I find some of my goals are difficulty to quantify and therefore, aren't adequately reflected in my finished objectives.
_____ E. I haven't written any objectives.
_____ F. I was forced to use artificial categories of objectives which had no meaning to me.
_____ G. Objectives shouldn't be weighted or evaluated equally.
_____ H. Deadlines used in written objectives turn out to have no meaning.
_____ I. Deadlines used in written objectives turn out to have no meaning.
_____ J. My objectives are not specific enough.
_____ K. My objectives tend to overestimate what I am capable of.
_____ L. My objectives tend to underestimate what I am capable of.
_____ M. My objectives pretty accurately reflect my capability.
_____ N. Other observations about my objectives (specify)

_____
_____

2. To what degree do your finished objectives relate to the institutional goals? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. They are closely related.
_____ B. They are somewhat related.
_____ C. They are not related.
_____ D. I have no idea what the institutional goals are.

3. What has been your experience with coaching to help you write your objectives? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. I have no need for coaching.
_____ B. I have received the coaching I needed from my supervisor.
_____ C. I have received the coaching I needed from other persons.
_____ D. I have received the coaching I needed from the literature.
_____ E. I needed help in writing objectives but I have not received adequate coaching as yet.

4. How are your objectvies set? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. My supervisor determines my objectives for the coming year.
_____ B. An intermediate condition between A and C.
_____ C. There is an interaction process whereby my supervisor and myself mutually determine and agree upon my objectives.
_____ D. An intermediate condition between C and F.
_____ E. I set my own objectives and my supervisor mechanically approves.

5. How familiar are you with your immediate superior's objectives? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. We go over them together.
_____ B. I am familiar enough so that my objectives mesh with my superiors.
_____ C. I have a fairly good idea of what my superior's objectives are.
_____ D. I have a vague idea of what my superior's objectives are.
_____ E. I have no idea what my superior's objectives are.

III. Implementing objectives

1. What has been your experience with coaching to help you implement your objectives? Check (✓) those appropriate.

_____ A. I have no need for coaching.
_____ B. I have received the coaching I needed from my supervisor.
_____ C. I have received the coaching I needed from other persons.
_____ D. I have received the coaching I needed from the literature.
_____ E. I needed help in implementing my objectives but I have not received adequate coaching as yet.

2. Once your objectives are determined, who determines how these objectives will be achieved? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. I solely determine the implementation process (within budget restrictions).
_____ B. My supervisor provides some general guidelines for implementing my objectives.
_____ C. My supervisor maintains close control on how I implement my objectives (within budget limitations).

IV. Appraisal process

1. How many times in the last year have you and your supervisor gone through the appraisal process or reviewed your objectives? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. Never.
_____ B. Once.
_____ C. Twice.
_____ D. Three times.
_____ E. Four times.

2. What was the effect of the review process with regard to your objectives? Check (✓) those appropriate.

_____ A. No effect - it was a very mechanical process.
_____ B. I discovered some unrealistic objectives and was allowed to change them accordingly.
_____ C. Because of unforeseen events, the review allowed some objectives to be revised or deleted.
_____ D. Because of new demands some new objectives were added.
_____ E. I feel very positively motivated.
_____ F. I feel negatively motivated.
_____ G. Some of my objectives were unrealistic or over optimistic but I was not allowed to change them and was penalized.
_____ H. My objectives underestimated my capabilities and therefore didn't reflect my actual accomplishments and as a result I was penalized.
_____ I. My objectives underestimated my capabilities and therefore my accomplishments far exceeded my objectives and as a result I received a very high rating.
_____ J. I have not gone through an appraisal process.
_____ K. Other effects (specify) _____
_____

3. What was the effect of the appraisal process with regard to implementation of your objectives? Check (✓) those appropriate.

_____ A. No effect, I had things well under control.
_____ B. No effect, it was a mechanical process.
_____ C. I discovered some areas where more emphasis needs to be placed.
_____ D. I discovered areas in which I need more coaching and made the necessary arrangements to receive this coaching.
_____ E. I discovered areas in which I need more coaching but I have no idea where to go from here.
_____ F. I feel positively motivated.
_____ G. I feel frustrated.

4. Do you feel the appraisal process is overemphasized at Harper? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. Definitely yes.
_____ B. To some extent.
_____ C. No opinion.
_____ D. It is doubtful.
_____ E. Definitely no.

5. In the appraisal process, how do you feel you are rated? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. I am rated on my personality traits.
_____ B. I am rated by the results I achieve.
_____ C. I am rated very arbitrarily.
_____ D. My supervisor simply rates everyone in the middle.
_____ E. My supervisor simply rates everyone at the top.
_____ F. The rating depends on political considerations.
_____ G. The rating depends on the merit money available.
_____ H. The relationship between goal accomplishment and rating is very difficulty to see.
_____ I. Other (specify) _____
_____

6. In the appraisal process, how is your rating achieved? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. My supervisor tells me my rating.
_____ B. An intermediate condition between A and C.
_____ C. We mutually agree on my rating.
_____ D. An intermediate condition between C and E.
_____ E. I determine the rating I will receive.
_____ F. I was never told my rating.
_____ G. Don't know.

7. How fairly do you feel you are rated during the appraisal process? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. I am underrated. I know other people in the organization doing no better job that I am who received better ratings.
_____ B. I feel I am fairly rated.
_____ C. I feel I am overrated compared to other people I know in the organization.
_____ D. No opinion.

8. What is your reaction when you receive negative feedback in the appraisal process? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. I react negatively branding the criticism as unfair and defending myself to my supervisor.
_____ B. I react negatively to the feedback given but I keep my feelings to myself.
_____ C. I have an immediate negative gut reaction but later I objectively evaluate the criticism. If I feel the feedback was fair I try to correct my behavior and if I feel it was unfair I ignore the criticism.
_____ D. Same as C above except if I feel the criticism was unfair I let my superior know about it.
_____ E. I react negatively but I put on a good show trying to convince my superior that I have responded.
_____ F. I react positively to almost all feedback, negative or positive.

9. What kind of problems do you encounter arriving at a rating during the appraisal process? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. No particular problems.
_____ B. It is difficult to measure the results called for in the objectives.
_____ C. It is difficult to reach agreement on whether or not the objectives has been achieved.
_____ D. It is difficult to summarize results achieved on all the objectives in one rating.
_____ E. It is difficult to balance objectives added with objectives deleted.
_____ F. Other (specify) _____
_____

V. Description of Harper's organization

1. Describe your perception of the communications climate at Harper. Check (✓) all those which are appropriate.

_____ A. Many people in the organization say one thing but mean something else.
_____ B. There are very few individuals in the organization with whom I feel free to discuss my real feelings concerning job related activities.
_____ C. When people talk to each other they are usually pretty honest with one another.
_____ D. People in the organization don't talk with one another enough.
_____ E. Communication breakdowns in the organization occur not by design but because of neglect and ineffectiveness.
_____ F. There is generally an adequate free flow of communication within the organization.

2. When a problem occurs, how do you perceive most individuals in the organization reacting? Check (✓) those appropriate.

_____ A. Search for someone to blame.
_____ B. Take immediate steps to protect themselves from the blame.
_____ C. Engage in a problem-solving process.
_____ D. Avoid facing the problem.
_____ E. Other (specify) _____
_____

3. Can creative change occur readily within the organization? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. Yes, whenever change can be justified
_____ B. Intermediate step between A and C.
_____ C. Only after much effort and a long period of time.
_____ D. Only after a monumental effort.
_____ E. It is hopeless.
_____ F. No opinion.

4. Do you feel you have the ability to effect major change in the organization? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. I can have a great deal of influence.
_____ B. I can have some influence.
_____ C. At best I would have a slight influence.
_____ D. I feel completely powerless.
_____ E. No opinion.

5. Describe the promotion and development potential in your organization as far as you are concerned. Check (✓) one.

_____ A. I am at as high a level of responsibility as I ever want to be.
_____ B. There are good opportunities for me to be promoted.
_____ C. While there is a very slim opportunity for me to be promoted as such, my present job and responsibilities could be greatly expanded.
_____ D. If I am ever to advance or develop any further in my profession, I will probably have to move elsewhere.
_____ E. While there is a very slim opportunity for me to be promoted as such, I feel I am being developed professionally in the organization.

6. 6. Where is the organization's greatest emphasis. Check (✓) one.

_____ A. It glorifies the past.
_____ B. It is most concerned about today.
_____ C. It looks to the future.
_____ D. It vacilates.
_____ E. No opinion.
_____ F. Other (specify) _____
_____

VI. Perception of supervisor

1. Generally do you find your supervisor supportive of the following aspects of the organization? Check (✓) the columns which are appropriate.

Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Not Supportive	
_____	_____	_____	A. The organization in general
_____	_____	_____	B. MBO system
_____	_____	_____	C. Individual development
_____	_____	_____	D. Institutional wide goals
_____	_____	_____	E. Supervisor's subordinates
_____	_____	_____	F. Supervisor's professional association

2. Do you feel your superior is a more effective manager as a result of MBO? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. Definitely yes.
_____ B. Maybe.
_____ C. I doubt it.
_____ D. Definitely not.
_____ E. It has made him less effective.
_____ F. It is hard to judge.

3. To what extent is your supervisor engaged in planning? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. If my supervisor is, I am not aware of it.
_____ B. The planning that my supervisor has engaged in is too narrow and inadequate.
_____ C. The planning that my supervisor has engaged in seems to be adequate. I was simply informed what these plans were.
_____ D. Not only is my supervisor's planning adequate but I was involved in the process.

4. How would you describe your supervisor? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. Reactive (on the defense)
_____ B. Inconsistent
_____ C. Proactive (on the offensive)
_____ D. Inactive
_____ E. Sensitive
_____ F. Sensitive and proactive.
_____ G. Other (describe) _____
_____

5. How has MBO effected the relationship between you and your supervisor? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. It has had no effect.
_____ B. It has led both of us to a better understanding of each others areas of responsibility.
_____ C. It has led both of us to a better understanding of my area of responsibility.
_____ D. It has reduced our relationship to one of a very nit-picking nature.
_____ E. It has affected our relationship in another way (specify)
_____
_____

6. When you have performed a minor task unsatisfactorily, how does your supervisor handle the situation? How would you like your supervisor to handle the situation? Check (✓) one in each column.

How he actually handles situation	How you would prefer he handle the situation
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

My supervisor:

A. calls me in immediately and informs me of my unsatisfactory behavior.
B. lets me know about my unsatisfactory performance by a series of indirect cues.
C. says nothing in person but notes the behavior on my performance records.
D. waits until the behavior becomes intolerable and then he tries to change my job and responsibilities.
E. tells me about my unsatisfactory performance at the next appraisal interview.
F. mentions it at an opportune time.
G. writes a memo.

VII. Description of job and self

1. How has your satisfaction with the job changed in the last year? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. My satisfaction with the job is much higher this year than it was a year ago.
_____ B. Intermediate step between A and C.
_____ C. My satisfaction level is unchanged.
_____ D. Intermediate step between C and E.
_____ E. My satisfaction with the job is much lower this year than it was a year ago.
_____ F. It is hard to judge.

2. How has you effectiveness to perform your job changed in the last year? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. My effectiveness on the job is much greater this year than it was a year ago.
_____ B. Intermediate step between A and C
_____ C. My effectiveness on the job is uncharged.
_____ D. Intermediate step between C and E.
_____ E. My effectiveness on the job is much lower this year than it was a year ago.
_____ F. It is hard to judge.

3. How would you describe your present job? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. It challenges me beyond my ability and leaves me frustrated.
_____ B. It challenges me so I am constantly increasing my achievement level.
_____ C. I can handle it without any sweat.
_____ D. It is so unchallenging I am bored.
_____ E. It challenges me but at the same time I would like some job enrichment.
_____ F. It challenges me but the work seems meaningless.
_____ G. Other (describe) _____
_____

4. How would you describe yourself? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. Reactive (on the defensive)
_____ B. Inconsistent
_____ C. Proactive (on the offensive)
_____ D. Inactive
_____ E. Sensitive
_____ F. Sensitive and proactive
_____ G. Flexible

5. When someone under you had performed a significant project unsatisfactorily, how do you handle the situation? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. I call them in immediately and inform them of their unsatisfactory behavior.
_____ B. I let the person know about his unsatisfactory performance by a series of indirect cues.
_____ C. I say nothing to the person but note the behavior in his performance record.
_____ D. I wait until the behavior becomes intolerable and then I try to change his job and responsibilities.
_____ E. I tell them about their unsatisfactory performance at the next appraisal interview.
_____ F. Other (describe) _____
_____

6. When someone under you has performed a minor task unsatisfactorily, how do you handle the situation? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. I call them in immediately and inform them of their unsatisfactory behavior.
_____ B. I let the person know about his unsatisfactory performance by a series of indirect cues.
_____ C. I say nothing to the person but note the behavior in his performance records.
_____ D. I wait until the behavior becomes intolerable and then I try to change the behavior or the job responsibilities.
_____ E. I tell them about their unsatisfactory performance at the next appraisal interview.
_____ F. Other (describe) _____
_____

William Rainey Harper College

APPENDIX C

Memo to: All Administrators

From: John Lucas J. a. L.

Date: October 10, 1977

Subject: MBO Survey

On September 27 an MBO survey was distributed to all administrators. As of this date we only have approximately 50% of those returned.

In order to determine the effectiveness of our MBO management system here at Harper it is necessary to obtain a good response. If you have misplaced your survey, please give our office a call on #263 and we will send you another.

For those who have returned the survey, we appreciate your cooperation.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
AUG 10 1979
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES